REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application with claims 1-4 being amended by this response. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 6 are found throughout the specification and specifically on page 8, lines 15-30 which discuss a plurality of selectable tables each having a different format and page 12, line 10-18 which discuss examples of tables each including various numbers of cells.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Touma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,809,266).

The present claimed invention recites a method in a computer system for designing under the control of a user a display of information. The method includes receiving instructions from the user to select a tabular format. In response to receiving instructions from the user to select the tabular format, a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format is displayed to the user. The dimensions of a selected cell within a selected one of the cell arrangements to permit display of a data selection are adjusted. Claims 1 and 6 each include similar limitations to those discussed above.

Touma et al. discloses a method and apparatus for generating reports using a graphical user interface. Touma et al. provides a plurality of data model objects and a data model painter for creating the data model objects. However, Touma et al. neither disclose nor suggest "displaying to the user a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format" as in the present claimed invention. The Examiner asserts that Touma et al. disclose an image set of predefined tables each having a plurality of cells in Figure 2A. Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, data model tools 214-222 in Figure 2A of Touma et al. are not a menu of data selections wherein each data selection provides a cell arrangement for display as in the present claimed invention. In fact, the data model tools each

perform a different function, activating different tools for creating data module objects. The data model tools of Touma et al. include a query tool (214) for creating a new query, a link tool (216) for linking different groups, a computation tool (218) for creating a summary, formula or place holder column, a parameter tool (220) for creating a new parameter, and a cross product tool (222) for creating a cross product group around two or more groups (see column 5, lines 10-28). The data model tools of Touma et al. provide tools for creating a display. However, none of the data model tools taken individually or in combination provide "a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format" as in the present claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Touma et al. showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 6 are not anticipated by Touma et al. As claims 2 and 4 are dependent on claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not anticipated by Touma et al. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 3 and 9-13 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 3 and 9-13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touma et al. and in further view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,407).

Smith et al. discloses a reconfigurable user interface for a modular patient monitor. The interface recognizes when new parameters are added or removed and automatically reconfigures the display and updates the menu selection options. However, similarly to Touma et al., Smith et al. neither disclose nor suggest "displaying to the user a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format" as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention. Smith et al. is concerned with automatically reconfiguring a display upon addition or removal of data. This is unlike the present claimed invention which is

concerned with generation of a display. Additionally, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Smith et al. neither disclose nor suggest "simultaneously displaying the first waveform superimposed upon the second waveform within the first cell" as claimed in claim 3 of the present invention.

Furthermore, there is no motivation or unity of objective for combining Touma et al. with Smith et al. Touma et al. is concerned with generation of a display while Smith et al. is concerned with automatically updating a previously generated display upon addition and deletion of data. Neither Touma et al. nor Smith et al. are concerned with "displaying to the user a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format" as in the present claimed invention. Thus, neither Touma et al. or Smith et al. provide for generation of a display formed by a desired arrangement of cells, each cell being size adjustable.

A combination of Touma et al. and Smith et al. would produce an apparatus for generating reports using a plurality of data model objects and a data model painter for creating the data model objects whereby the reports generated are automatically updated upon addition or deletion of data. Thus, even if Touma et al. and Smith et al. were to be combined, they would not produce a method of "designing under the control of a user a display of information, comprising ... displaying to the user a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format; and...adjusting dimensions of a selected cell within a selected one of the cell arrangements to permit display of a data selection" as in the present claimed invention. This combination also would not provide for "simultaneously displaying the first waveform superimposed upon the second waveform within the first cell" as claimed in claim 3 of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Touma et al. or Smith et al. showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable over Touma et al. or Smith et al. when taken alone or in combination. As claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, it is respectfully

submitted that this claim is also patentable over Touma et al. or Smith et al. Claim 9 is a method claim including a similar limitation to claim 1 and thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 discussed above. As claims 10-13 are dependent on claim 9 it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touma et al. and in further view of Duane et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,721).

Duane et al. discloses a method and apparatus for providing automatic layout capabilities for forms. Upon selecting a control item for display on the form, the preferred coordinates and size of the item are automatically selected. Any intersecting control items are then adjusted to accommodate the new control item. However, similarly to Touma et al., Duane et al. neither disclose nor suggest "displaying to the user a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format" as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention. Additionally, contrary to the assertions of the Examiner, Duane et al. neither discloses nor suggests "displaying to the user a file name selection menu displaying a region in which all previous user selections may be saved for future use" as claimed in claim 5 of the present invention. The Examiner cites Figure 7 and the accompanying discussion show this feature. In fact, Figure 7 illustrates a list of available control items for creating the computer form. Through a click and drag operation, control items are placed on the computer form. This is unlike the present invention as claimed in claim 5 which allows for saving previous user selections for future use. Duane et al. neither discloses nor suggests that the display screen illustrated in Figure 7 displays "a file name selection menu displaying a region in which all previous user selections may be saved for future use" as claimed in claim 5 of the present invention.

A combination of Touma et al. and Duane et al. would produce an apparatus for generating reports using a plurality of data model objects and a data model painter for creating the data model objects whereby the reports are automatically updated to accommodate the addition of new control items. Thus, even if Touma et al. and Duane et al. were to be combined, they would not produce a method of "designing under the control of a user a display of information, comprising ... displaying to the user a menu of data selections, each data selection providing a cell arrangement for display in tabular format; and...adjusting dimensions of a selected cell within a selected one of the cell arrangements to permit display of a data selection" as in the present claimed invention. This combination also would not provide for "displaying to the user a file name selection menu displaying a region in which all previous user selections may be saved for future use" as claimed in claim 5 of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Touma et al. or Duane et al. showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not unpatentable over Touma et al. or Duane et al. when taken alone or in combination. As claim 5 is dependent on claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also unpatentable over Touma et al. or Duane et al. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7 and 8 under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touma et al. and in further view of Inaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,916).

Inaki et al. discloses an apparatus able to independently relocate and reset a size of cells. However, similarly to Touma et al., Inaki et al. neither disclose nor suggest "displaying an image set of predefined tables, each of said predefined tables having a plurality of cells in a predetermined arrangement; (b) selecting one of the predefined tables; (c) displaying, the predetermined arrangement of cells defined by the predefined

table" as claimed in claim 6 of the present invention. Additionally, contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, Inaki et al. neither disclose nor suggest "redimensioning the cells within the column so as to abut the new column border location" as claimed in claim 8 of the present invention. Unlike the present invention as claimed in claim 8, in Inaki et al., when a cell is resized, the remaining cells in the same column are not also resized (See Figure 21 of Inaki et al.).

Furthermore, a combination of Touma et al. and Inaki et al. would produce an apparatus for generating reports using a plurality of data model objects and a data model painter for creating the data model objects whereby cells which may be produced using the data model objects and data model painter may be individually resized. Thus, even if Touma et al. and Inaki et al. were to be combined, they would not produce a method including the steps of "displaying an image set of predefined tables, each of said predefined tables having a plurality of cells in a predetermined arrangement; (b) selecting one of the predefined tables; (c) displaying the predetermined arrangement of cells defined by the predefined table" as claimed in claim 6 of the present invention. This combination also would not provide for "redimensioning the cells within the column so as to abut the new column border location" as claimed in claim 8 of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Touma et al. or Inaki et al. showing the above discussed features. It is thus further respectfully submitted that independent claim 6 is not unpatentable over Touma et al. or Inaki et al. when taken alone or in combination. As claims 7 and 8 are dependent on claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also unpatentable over Touma et al. or Inaki et al. It is thus, further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 50-2828.

Respectfully submitted,
William Buresh et al.

By: _____
Jack Schwartz
Reg. No. 34,721

Jack Schwartz & Associates
1350 Broadway
Suite 1510
New York, New York 10018
Tel. No. (212) 971-0416
Fax No. (212) 971-0417

September 13, 2004